

Application No. 10/531,086  
Amdt. dated 23 January 2009  
Reply to Office Action of 12 September 2008

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 20-22, 25, 27, 29 and 32 under 35U.S.C. Section 112 as indefinite. The Examiner points out the term "derivative" is unacceptable. Applicant has amended Claim 20 so that now it deletes the term in both instances thereby rendering the claim definite.

Claims 1-3, 3-9 and 26 have been rejected under 35U.S.C. 102b as anticipated by Gondos et al. while claims 4, 12 and 26 have been rejected as unpatentable over Gondos et al. The Examiner has indicated that claims 23 and 24 are allowed, which action is appreciated. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 19 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 13 and, as such, believes that all claims should be allowable in view of the cited art.

In addition to the above, claims 30-31 have been rejected as being in improper form because each are an improper multiple dependent claim. Claims 30-31 have been amended to remove the multiple dependencies and, as such, are now believed to be acceptable.

Claim 33 has been objected to because of a faulty dependency. Claim 33 has been amended to reflect its proper dependency upon Claim 32.

Applicant notes that it has added new Claim 34 which is identical to Claim 25 with the exception of its dependency upon Claim 1.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

Application No. 10/531,086  
Amdt. dated 23 January 2009  
Reply to Office Action of 12 September 2008

No further fee or petition is believed to be necessary. However, should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he/she is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Application No. 10/531,086  
Amdt. dated 23 January 2009  
Reply to Office Action of 12 September 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 23 January 2009

**Gerald T Shekleton**  
Reg. No. 27,466  
Husch Blackwell Sanders Welsh & Katz  
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Phone: (312) 655-1511  
Fax: (312) 655-1501